

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/438,084

Applicant(s)

ROTHERMEL ET AL.

Examiner

Ted T. Vo

Art Unit

2122

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Ted T. Vo. (3) _____(2) Applicants' representative, ARIEL ROGSON. (4) _____Date of Interview: 04 March 2003.Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____Claim(s) discussed: 1-55.Identification of prior art discussed: None.Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner called applicants' representative, Mr. Rogson, to discuss a restriction/election requirement to the claims, grouped as I(1-31, 43-55), II(32), III(33-42). Mr. Rogson responded that the election of claims would be depended on his organization decision; however, to proceed the examiner in the examination process, he would elect group I with traverse .

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an
Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required